

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed November 27, 2007. Through this response, claims 1, 7, 13, 20, and 26 have been amended in a manner consistent with the suggestions by the Examiner (see, page 4 of the final Office Action). Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims 1-30 are respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-30 have been rejected as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although Applicants respectfully disagree that the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter, in the interest of expediting allowance, Applicants have amended the claims in a manner consistent with the suggestions by the Examiner (see, page 4 of the final Office Action).

In view of the above-noted claim amendments, Applicants believe the claims to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been rendered moot, and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 26-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Kelly et al.* ("Kelly," U.S. Pat. No. 6,728,740). Although Applicants respectfully disagree that claims 26-30 are unpatentable over *Kelly*, in the interest of expediting allowance of the claims, Applicants have amended claim 26 as suggested by the Examiner (see, page 4 of the final Office Action) to "overcome the rejection." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is rendered moot. Additionally, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn for at least the reason that

Kelly fails to disclose, teach, or **suggest "means for extracting a portion of each hardware driven number, the portion less than the whole of each hardware driven number,"** as recited in claim 26.

Because independent claim 26 is allowable over *Kelly*, dependent claims 27-30 are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 27-30 contain all elements of their respective base claim. See, e.g., *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims are in condition for allowance. Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, and similarly interpreted statements, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/dr/

David Rodack
Registration No. 47,034

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500